

APPROVED

AMESBURY PLANNING BOARD

March 28, 2016

**CITY HALL AUDITORIUM,
62 FRIEND STREET, AMESBURY, MA**

Meeting called to order at 7:03 PM

PRESENT: David Frick, Ted Semesnyei, Scott Mandeville, Robert Laplante, Lorri Krebs, Karen Solstad, Lars Johannessen

ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: Nipun Jain, City Planner, Susan Yeames, Recording Secretary.

MINUTES:

February 22, 2016 – Motion by Robert Laplante, second by Lorri Krebs to approve the minutes. AIF.

February 22, 2016 – Motion by Robert Laplante to approve the executive session minutes, second by Ted Semesnyei to approve the minutes. AIF.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

103-107 Macy Street – Amesbury Chevrolet – Continued to April 11. Motion by Scott Mandeville, second by Lorri Krebs. AIF.

24 POND VIEW, 0 SUMMIT AVE. – VILLAGE AT BAILEY'S POND

Applicant's attorney Jeffrey Roelofs distributes chronology. He goes over list of submittals and events. The team has met with Design Review Committee twice. Shows a series of building designs. DRC is looking for variety in design, color, and texture. We think we have made significant progress.

Scott Mandeville (member of Design Review Committee) speaks on discussions with design review committee. Site layout, cut through path, front of houses, back finishes, very productive.

Lars Johannessen: We asked to see the back of the buildings.

Jeff Roelofs: No issues of resistance. Working well together

Nipun Jain explains the design review process and what has transpired. He explains what the Planning Board is looking for. Still a work in progress.

Jeff Roelofs: We are trying to put a community building on the project. Should there be a pool? Would like meeting space. This will be reflected on next site plan. Each unit will have a 2 car garage. There will be scattered visitor parking spaces. The City wants wider trails than those approved in 2012 at 4' will now be 6'. Sidewalk along Summit Ave. has been converted from a sidewalk to trail connector. This could be unusable in the winter.

Karen Solstad wants a safe sidewalk. Need year round access safe for children.

Scott Mandeville discussion over bus issues. Buses cannot use Summit Ave because Swett's Hill on the other end is too narrow and curvy to accommodate a bus.

Robert Laplante: Is there a requirement for a new development to have a sidewalk?

APPROVED

Nipun Jain: It would be difficult to have the trail open in winter. There are limitations for salt and sand in riverfront area. The best solution would be to provide safe pedestrian access might be the sidewalk on Summit Ave.

Ted Semesnyei: Walking through development should be shorter than a sidewalk around the edge.

Robert Laplante: Where would the school bus stop be located?

Jeff Roelofs: At the primary development it would be at the main access drive.

David Frick: They would probably have to keep the access paved and clear of snow.

Nipun Jain: They should get input from con com before the applicant make a decision on what is the requirement for pedestrian traffic for the school bus. They need to appear & get approval from the con com.

Jeff Roelofs: I can go to con com and state what the planning board is looking for.

Nipun Jain: To summarize – confirm location of bus stop, provide safe pedestrian access to that point from both pods, and determine which is the best way – keep it along Summit Ave as it was approved or to evaluate whether you can make a connection through the riverfront area and if the con com would approve it, and also in that circumstance what measures would the association have to take to keep it open year round, in areas where there is a need for hand rails and accessibility needs that it all complies with requirements, and any other requirement that insures that you can get from the cul de sac in pod 2 all the way to the entrance of the main development.

Ted human nature...people will want to go the shortest route from point A to B. People might just find a way to walk within the development.

Jeff Roelofs: One of the questions that Stantec raised in 2012 the plan we had for the larger pod had a loop access, the plan now shows full access off Beacon Street.

Robert Laplante: It is a very dangerous street.

David Frick: Traffic study suggests that Beacon St. be open.

Jeff Roelofs: The limited access on Beacon Street was originally proposed due to neighbor comments.

Nipun Jain: It would be helpful for the Board to see how this area looks. We need to have the traffic consultant report to the Planning Board to describe the new access road.

Jeff Roelofs: We will provide you with an aerial depiction. There is another site plan forthcoming. We're trying to get more visitor parking.

Lorri Krebs: Where will the trash be picked up.

Jeff Roelofs: Trash pick up will be curbside at each house by a private company. The next site plan will show sidewalks in front of buildings. Mail delivery has been a topic of discussion.

Upper pad will have their own mail box center. Whatever the postmaster requires.

Scott Mandeville: The DRC has discussed this – We're still working on it.

Nipun Jain: The DRC has been discussing:

1. sidewalks
2. list of waivers
3. road width
4. cul de sac
5. fire access
6. walk out basements in some units
7. retaining walls

APPROVED

Jeff Roelofs: Before any wall is constructed engineered plans will be reviewed by the City before anything happens.

Nipun Jain: They must be able to provide proof that a structure can be built within the confines of storm water and other impacts have been considered.

Jeff Roelofs: We request a continuance until May 9.

Motion by Ted Semesnyi to continue Baileys Pond until May 9, second by Scott Mandeville. AIF

~~~~~  
**Motion by Ted Semesnyi to continue 60 Merrimac Street, Hatter's Point Marina to April 11, second by Lars Johannessen. 6 in favor, Robert Laplante recused.**

**Motion by Robert Laplante to approve a 40R Minor Modification to 36 Haverhill Road – Amesbury Heights. Second by Karen Solstad.**

**Nipun Jain:** There were two items to be requested by the applicant. One was the signoff on the retaining wall to recap at last meeting, the applicant was instructed to resolve the outstanding item which is the global stability report and there is a final memo from Stantec saying that the proposed retaining wall engineering and supporting documents are satisfactory.

**Motion by Robert Laplante to approve the retaining wall along the driveway as approved by Stantec, second by Karen Solstad.**

**Nipun Jain:** The second item was the change requested to the detention basin labeled X on the approved set of plans. There have been exchanges between the applicant engineer and the board's consultant. To summarize 90% of the issues have been satisfactorily addressed. There is a paragraph in the email from Michael Leach that indicates the next steps. If the board chooses to approve this as a minor modification and the plans are updated accordingly then the applicant has to bring plans that supersede the approved plans reflecting this change. They are waiting for endorsement by the Con Com (April 4 meeting). They have to produce final plans for the Con Com to endorse, they have to update the guardrail detail as requested by Stantec, and the endorsement of the board tonight per Stantec's recommendation.

**Conor Nagle, VHB:** Wood guard rails beefed up the quality for emergency access driveway.

**Lars Johannessen:** Pressure treated wood? Regular chain link colored black surrounding the pond.

**Robert Laplante:** Should guard rail be wood or steel? It should meet DOT safety requirements.

**Nipun Jain:** Stantec should make the final decision on the safest design for the guardrail to meet DOT standards.

**Nipun Jain suggested** recommendation to Stantec. To present to Stantec a detail that satisfies the recommendation if it's going to be steel let it be Coretan. All the other requirements that Stantec has recommended in regards to providing final plans be provided to the board after necessary steps have been taken either to modify the plans or to get other approvals. And to recommend the changes here as approved by Stantec.

**David Frick:** What did we approve when we first started?

## APPROVED

**Nipun Jain:** The request was made for change to the space and it was determined by the board that this would be categorized as a minor modification. You sent the applicant to discuss this matter with Stantec and if Stantec comes back with a clean recommendation go ahead and do it then it's done. They came back with a clean recommendation as far as the proposed technical aspects, they also advocated for the steps.

**Motion by Lars Johannessen to approve minor modification to detention basin X as per Stantec recommendation and as far as providing the guard rail detail they should follow up with Stantec recommendation. If it's steel then it be Coretan. Also to provide the necessary final plans as recommended by Stantec for endorsement by the board. Second by Karen Solstad. (no vote).**

**Robert Laplante:** Why do you keep insisting that if it's steel it be Coretan?

**Nipun Jain:** For visual impression. Coretan is part of DOT standards and fire dept. standards.

**Lars withdrawns his original motion.**

It will be returned to Stantec to see if the beefed up wood is good or will a steel guard rail be necessary. Does the guard rail have to meet DOT highway standards even though it is an access road

**Motion by Ted Semesnyei to allow the applicant's representative to work with Stantec to come up with an acceptable guardrail, second by Lars Johannessen. If it's steel, Coretan should be considered. AIF.**

~~

**Point Shore Meadows – 19 Evans Place. Additional review fees of \$19,500 have been received.**

**Motion by Lars Johannessen to adjourn at 8:45 p.m., second by Lorri Krebs. AIF.**